



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.          | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/721,673               | 11/24/2003  | Wanguo Qin           | 188122002200        | 5631             |
| 25226                    | 7590        | 04/19/2006           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  |             |                      | KIK, PHALLAKA       |                  |
| 755 PAGE MILL RD         |             |                      | ART UNIT            |                  |
| PALO ALTO, CA 94304-1018 |             |                      | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |

2825

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                               |                            |  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.<br>10/721,673 | Applicant(s)<br>QIN ET AL. |  |
|                              | Examiner<br>Phallaka Kik      | Art Unit<br>2825           |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003 & interview on 4/10/06.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)          |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>20060414</u>                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action responds to the Application filed on 11/24/2003 and interview conducted on 4/10/2006.

***Restriction***

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-62,70, drawn to method/computer programmed system/computer executable software code for transforming a circuit from a first topology to a reduced topology, classified in class 716, subclass 3.
  - II. Claims 63-67, drawn to a method of transforming a first circuit from a first topology to a reduced topology involving reducing the circuit elements in a bottom-up fashion from the leaf nodes to the root of the tree-like topological approximation that was generated and identified, classified in class 716, subclass 3.
  - III. Claim 68, drawn to a method of reducing capacitors within a circuit topology involving moving and merging capacitors identified associated with the particular connections to the transistor drain or source node, classified in class 716, subclass 2.
  - IV. Claim 69, drawn to a method of reducing nodes within a circuit topology involving merging nodes P1 and P2 into one node if P1 and P2 satisfy the particular conditions, classified in class 716, subclass 2.
3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination IV has separate utility such as reducing circuits with the particular capacitors and resistors connections that are not covered by the transistor related connections of subcombination III, and further wherein the subcombinations do not overlap in scope or are not obvious variants, since the reduction steps are applied differently to the particular capacitors and transistors connections recited in each invention. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions I and II are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants of each other and have different mode of operation, because the reducing of the circuit elements in a bottom-up fashion from the leaf nodes to the root of the tree-like topological approximation as claimed in invention II do not overlap in scope and is not an obvious variants of invention I, which includes producing the topological approximation as a minimum spanning tree and identifying one or more symmetric nodes in a top-down fashion from the single input tree structure (see claims 5 and 7), and would therefore operate differently from the reducing steps/means of invention I.

Inventions I,II and III,IV are related as combination and subcombination.

Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the method/computer programmed system/computer executable software code for transforming a circuit from a first topology to a reduced topology of inventions I and II could still operate for the particular circuit elements and their connections not involving those as recited in invention III and IV. The subcombination has separate utility such as specifically reducing the circuit topology involving the particular capacitors and resistors in the particular connections as recited in inventions III and IV.

4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. A telephone call was made to Thomas Chan (Reg. No. 51,543) on 4/10/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

7. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

8. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phallaka Kik whose telephone number is 571-272-1895. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:30AM-7PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Chiang can be reached on 571-272-7483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**or faxed to:**

571-273-8300



Phallaka Kik  
U.S. Patent Examiner  
April 14, 2006